



CURRENT NEWS

PART I - EARLY BIRD EDITION - 0730

PART II - MAIN EDITION - PUBLISHED AT 1130



Thursday, December 2, 1982

THIS PUBLICATION IS PREPARED BY THE AIR FORCE AS EXECUTIVE AGENT FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE. IT IS NOT TO BE DISTRIBUTED OUTSIDE THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE. IT IS NOT TO BE USED AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR NEWSPAPERS, PERIODICALS AND BROADCASTS AS A MEANS OF KEEPING INFORMED ABOUT THE NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL NEWS DEVELOPMENTS. USE OF THESE ARTICLES HERE, OF COURSE, DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN OFFICIAL ENDORSEMENT. FURTHER REPRODUCTION FOR PRIVATE USE OR GAIN IS SUBJECT TO THE ORIGINAL COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS.

NEW YORK TIMES
DELAYED

WASHINGTON POST

2 December 1982

Pg. 17

Ex-Defense Chief: Cut Arms Outlay to Avert 'Economic Crisis'

By George C. Wilson
Washington Post Staff Writer

Former defense secretary Harold Brown called yesterday for cutting military spending by \$50 billion in fiscal 1985 and 1986 as part of an effort "to save us from an economic crisis and retain sufficient military capability."

Brown, who as secretary in the Carter administration had pushed for defense increases but smaller ones than the 7 to 8 percent a year President Reagan is recommending, also said taxes have to be raised and entitlement programs cut to reduce projected \$200 billion deficits, which he said should be slashed by more than half.

Focusing on the Pentagon budget, Brown told a group of reporters that "you have to make reductions now" in Reagan's requests or it will be too late to affect spending levels in fiscal 1985 and 1986. He recommended a \$25 billion reduction in expenditures for each of those two years.

EX-DEFENSE CHIEF...Pg. 4

WASHINGTON POST

2 December 1982 Pg. 1

Lobbying To Save MX Intensified

Panel Vote Today
Spurs Pentagon,
White House Blitz

By George C. Wilson
Washington Post Staff Writer

The Reagan administration launched an intensive intercontinental lobbying effort this week to prevent the MX missile from being blown up on the pad by the House Appropriations Committee today in an important test of President Reagan's defense buildup.

Reagan telephoned from Brazil on MX...Pg. 2

BALTIMORE SUN

2 December 1982

Pg. 4

NATO leaders propose more high-tech weapons

Brussels (AP)—Western military leaders yesterday proposed development of new non-nuclear weapons to reduce the need to use atomic warheads in the first stage of a Soviet conventional attack on Europe.

Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger told North Atlantic Treaty Organization defense ministers at a year-end planning session that scientific know-how could improve conventional defenses at potentially lower cost, a senior U.S. defense official said.

The official, who briefed reporters on condition he not be identified, said Mr. Weinberger called for a drive to introduce high technology weapons with "unprecedented quality that would enable us virtually to strike the targets at which we aim."

Among the technology envisioned are "electronics which make possible extra precision in delivery of weapons," he said.

West German Defense Minister Manfred Woerner said the 14 ministers endorsed Mr. Weinberger's proposals and agreed to implement them, but no specific plans or timetables were announced.

"The idea is not to make weapons more powerful and destructive, but to make them more accurate," said Canadian Adm. Robert H. Falls, chairman of NATO's military committee.

Increasing conventional forces, Admiral Falls said, can "insure you can maintain and hold and not be driven back to such an extent you have to contemplate using nuclear weapons."

Admiral Falls said non-nuclear firepower could someday be substituted for short-range nuclear weapons now earmarked to stop a second wave of Soviet troops sweeping westward.

"If you don't want to go nuclear, you'd better have the capability to hit the second echelon behind the lines," he said.

Mr. Weinberger and Admiral Falls
NATO...Pg. 2

WASHINGTON POST

2 December 1982 Pg. 16

'Too Late to Stop' Fleet Buildup, Says Navy Secretary

By Michael Getler
Washington Post Staff Writer

Navy Secretary John F. Lehman Jr. yesterday told critics of the Reagan administration's planned five-year, \$100 billion fleet buildup, "sorry...it's too late to stop it...we've got the 600-ship Navy."

The Navy's civilian chief made his comments in response to a statement by longtime Pentagon consultant William W. Kaufmann, a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who helped write the annual Pentagon report to Congress for nearly every secretary of defense in the 1960s and 1970s.

Kaufmann estimated that the United States can handle the military problems it faces around the world with an annual growth rate in defense expenditures of about 6 percent instead of Reagan's projected 7 to 8 percent, at a five-year savings of about \$250 billion.

Speaking at an all-day seminar on military spending at the Brookings Institution, Kaufmann said that his first priority for reducing Reagan's \$1.6 trillion five-year defense plan would be to squelch the Navy's "ambitions for a 600-ship" fleet. That ambition is "not only not feasible within the existing program but it is also not necessary," he declared.

"Professor, I'm sorry to suggest to you that it's too late to stop it," Lehman countered. "We are already up to 514 ships (counting some newer vessels in the reserves) and we've got 106 more ships under contract...more under contract than at any time since the Korean War. So it not only is affordable, it is being done."

FLEET BUILDUP...Pg. 2

Helen Young, Chief, Current News Branch, 897-8786

For special research services or distribution call Harry Zubkoff, Chief, News Clipping & Analysis Service, 895-2834

Daniel Friedman, Assistant Chief

THURSDAY MORNING, 2 DECEMBER 1982

MX...Continued

his tour of Latin America to urge several committee members to vote against an amendment sponsored by Rep. Joseph P. Addabbo (D-N.Y.) to stop the MX from going into production.

Vice President Bush made similar calls here, while Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger phoned from Brussels, where he is attending a NATO alliance defense ministers meeting, to argue that losing the MX vote would be sending the wrong signal to the new leadership in the Kremlin.

Pentagon research director Richard D. DeLauer and Air Force generals at the Strategic Air Command in Omaha, Neb., also were enlisted in the campaign to save the president's plan to put 100 MX intercontinental missiles, each carrying 10 nuclear warheads, in a closely spaced "Dense Pack" formation in Wyoming.

Addabbo said last night that the Reagan administration's lobbying effort had become so intense that he no longer felt confident he would prevail in cutting \$988 million for production of MX from the fiscal 1983 defense appropriations bill now before the committee. He said that the odds had shifted, declaring that he was going into the committee session with 24 votes against 27 for Reagan, with the rest undecided.

In a letter to his House colleagues arguing that they would be wasting "well over \$35 billion" by allowing the Pentagon to go ahead with the missile, Addabbo wrote, "To hear the president talk about MX, you'd think the future of Western civilization hung in the balance if we did not proceed."

Lobbyists on both sides said the vote in the House committee comprised of 33 Democrats and 22 Republicans was too close to call.

One of the undecided committee

NATO...Continued

cautioned, however, that the emphasis on high technology did not mean a shift in NATO's primary reliance on nuclear forces to deter attack.

Under the long-standing NATO doctrine of flexible response, the Soviets have been warned that they would always face the possibility of being attacked by nuclear missiles or bombs if they launched a conventional attack.

Mr. Weinberger and the admiral also said high technology would not be a means of reducing the arsenal of 6,000 short-range nuclear warheads now deployed in Europe.

Admiral Falls said any shift to

members was Republican Rep. Virginia Smith from central Nebraska's sparsely settled Third District, who found herself inundated by administration pleas on behalf of MX, beginning with a telephone call from President Reagan early Sunday morning.

"Hello Virginia," she quoted the president as saying. "I'm sure that you are glad that the MX is not going into your district."

"His key point," Smith said last night, "was that unless we support the MX initiative we will be sending the wrong signal to the Soviets. It wasn't a hard sell, but he ended up by saying, 'I hope I can count on your support.'"

She said Air Force Gen. George Miller, deputy commander of the Strategic Air Command in Omaha and an old acquaintance of hers, followed up the president's call with one of his own. "SAC did not buy Dense Pack wholeheartedly, he said," according to Smith's account, "but now feels it is viable and is the best way to go."

Smith said she expressed concern to Miller that anti-ballistic missiles might be deployed near her district to protect the Dense Pack formation of MX missiles just across the Nebraska border outside Warren Air Force Base near Cheyenne, Wyo. "He said it was extremely unlikely that this would happen, certainly not in the near future."

She also was called by DeLauer from the Pentagon, who offered to come to her office to brief her on the virtues of Dense Pack. "I don't think I can say anything more persuasive than the president has said," DeLauer told her in what Smith described as a low-pressure pitch.

Bush topped off the administration's lobbying of Smith with a phone call yesterday. She recalled that he said: "I'm not going to use the term bargaining chip for the MX, but it is an important aid to the arms control negotiations."

The Air Force also tried to counter critics of the MX and the Dense Pack deployment plan by issuing a statement saying a Nov. 8 test of how well the hardened MX silos would hold up under Soviet attack "surpassed Air Force expectations in terms of resistance to blast effects."

Col. Mike Terrill, who runs the Air Force's MX information office from the top floor of the Pentagon, said the test showed each MX missile could be wrapped in enough concrete and steel in the Dense Pack formation to survive attack by a 25-megaton Soviet warhead.

Chairman John G. Tower (R-Tex.) of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Chairman Ted Stevens (R-Alaska) of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee on defense and Sens. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) and John W. Warner (R-Va.) also joined the lobbying act by signing a letter linking MX to success at the negotiating table with the Soviets in Geneva.

It urged congressional colleagues to "avoid making a hasty, ill-informed decision" such as denying \$988 million in MX production money as Addabbo is advocating.

Both Addabbo and Stevens have pledged to send the fiscal 1983 defense appropriations bill to

high technology could cost the alliance more money at a time when most recession-gripped NATO governments are unable to meet a 1978

FLEET BUILDUP...Continued

"We accomplished it," Lehman continued, by "front-loading," meaning going to Congress and then the defense industry quickly to get a large number of ships authorized and under contract in the early Reagan defense budgets. People forgot, he added, that "we are now in the fourth Reagan budget," a reference to the budgets for this year and last, plus other revisions.

Furthermore, Lehman claimed, the last 15 ships delivered are coming in ahead of schedule and under cost because of the economies of large-scale production.

So unless there are cuts in the Navy budget beyond those being advocated by many critics, Lehman said "we are essentially there" with the 600-ship fleet in service by 1989.

Kaufmann, however, said the way he looked at the numbers, the Navy has already committed \$35.1 billion and there is "still \$77.4 billion to go to get to the mythical 600 ships. So the commitment is by no means made... there is still ample time" to cut it.

Lehman argued that much of what's left was for smaller vessels whose deliveries come after the 600-ship level is reached.

Philip A. Odeen, a former White House and Pentagon official, voiced concern that the Navy's great emphasis on procurement now would squeeze out funds for combat readiness years from now when all the construction bills come due.

"We'll have a terrible time," Odeen warned.

Lehman said the bigger Navy was not a result simply of admirals pushing for it.

"We can get along with a smaller Navy," he said, but only if an American government decides to cut down on treaty commitments with some 40 nations around the world and otherwise pulls back from areas of interest. In the meantime, he argued, it was the Navy's job to fight and win wherever it may have to and, given the expanding Soviet fleet, it was impossible to do that with any confidence with fewer than 600 vessels.

the floors of their chambers for a vote during the three-week lame-duck session of Congress rather than keep the Pentagon at a low level of funding under a continuing spending resolution for the entire government.

If the bills now at issue are stripped of MX production money, the administration almost surely will try again next year to fund the missile program. However, one administration official said yesterday, "It will be a real kick in the midriff if we lose on the MX tomorrow" in the vote by the House committee.

Asked last night which way she would vote after being subjected to the administration's lobbying blitz, Smith, who says she has more cows than people in her district, replied: "There's been a change in my district. There is now a feeling that we're putting more into defense than we should. People feel there is too much waste. I'm not sure how I will be voting."

commitment to increase spending annually by 3 percent above inflation.

Admiral Falls said he favored the technology proposals "with great optimism the economy will one day turn around and allow more money to be spent on defense."